

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

Claim 7 is currently being cancelled.

Claim 1 is currently being amended.

Claim 8 is currently being added.

This amendment adds, cancels and amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending and adding the claims as set forth above, claims 1-6 and 8 are now pending in this application.

Indication of Allowable Subject Matter:

Applicant appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter made in the Office Action with respect to claims 3 and 7. By way of this amendment and reply, 'objected to' claim 7 has been canceled, whereby new claim 8 corresponds to claim 7 written in independent form. Thus, claim 8 is in condition for allowance in accordance with the indications made in the Office Action.

Telephone Interview Conducted on June 20, 2006:

Applicant's representative appreciates the courtesies extended to him by Examiner Smith, during a telephone interview conducted on June 20, 2006. During that interview, the claims were discussed with reference to the Hiramatsu patent cited against the claims, whereby Applicant's representative argued that Hiramatsu does not change antenna connections based on an erroneous relationship that occurred during installation work, but rather Hiramatsu changes antenna characteristics from previous antenna characteristics utilized during an operational state of his system.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0016504 to Dam et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,600,935 to Hiramatsu; and claims 2, 4, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dam et al. in view of Hiramatsu and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,397,083 to Martin et al. These rejections are traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

In the rejection made against claim 1 based on the combination of Dam and Hiramatsu, the final Office Action asserts that “In addition Hiramatsu discloses to correct erroneous connections that have occurred during installation work of said base station apparatus (which reads on column 3 lines 6-13).” Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion.

Namely, column 3, lines 6-13 of Hiramatsu describes an adjusting method for changing the connection of connectors, in order to adjust the phase and/or amplitude of an RF section. This changing of connectors is done in order to modify the antenna characteristics (e.g., change the pointing angle, the beamwidth, etc.), whereby the previous antenna characteristics are assumed to be proper for detecting signals coming in at a first direction.

In other words, Hiramatsu’s adjusting of connectors is done to modify the characteristics of an RF section to receive signals of a particular kind and direction, and not to correct for erroneous connections that have occurred during installation work of the RF section.

However, to expedite prosecution, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the antenna switching unit is used to correct an erroneous relationship between said plurality of antennas and said plurality of transmission/reception circuits, wherein said erroneous relationship occurred during installation work of said base station apparatus. Hiramatsu’s adjusting is not done to correct an erroneous relationship between antennas and transmission/reception circuits that occurred during installation work, but rather to change a current operating state of his phased array antenna to suit a particular purpose.

Accordingly, since neither Dam nor Martin rectifies the above-mentioned deficiencies of Hiramatsu, claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Dam and Hiramatsu.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 22, 2006

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819